

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants have carefully considered this application in connection with the Examiner's Final Rejection electronically delivered April 15, 2008, and the Advisory Action dated July 8, 2008. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-6 in the application. In previous responses, the Applicants added Claims 7-9, and amended Claims 1-5 and 7. In the present response, the Applicants have amended Claims 3 and 7, added new Claims 10-12 and canceled Claims 1-2 without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, Claims 3-12 are currently pending in the application. Support for the amendment can be found, for example, in paragraphs 6 and 22-28 of the original specification.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over "Two-Stage Mel-Warped Wiener Filter for Robust Speech Recognition" to Agarwal, *et al.* (hereinafter "Agarwal") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,446,038 to Bayya, *et al.* (hereinafter "Bayya"), and further in view of "Low-Bitrate Distributed Speech Recognition for Packet-Based and Wireless Communication" to Bernard, *et al.* (hereinafter "Bernard"). The Applicants respectfully disagree regarding pending Claims 3-5 and 7-9 in view of the present amendment and the below argument.

More specifically, the cited references do not disclose determining the likelihood of observing a feature vector including calculating a likelihood of observing the feature vector o_t by

providing a transformation matrix T_t and the feature vector o_t , which is unmodified, to a probability function as recited in amended independent Claims 3 and 7. For example, Agrawal discloses modifying a feature vector based on SNR to adjust the feature vector to better match a model parameter. (*See the Abstract.*) Thus, Agrawal relies on removing noise from a signal for speech recognition systems. This differs from providing an unmodified feature vector for calculating the likelihood of observing the feature vector as presently claimed. The Applicants fail to find where the other cited references cure the noted deficiencies of Agrawal in view of the amended Claims 3 and 7.

Accordingly, the cited combination of Agarwal, Bayya and Bernard does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of amended independent Claims 3 and 7 and Claims dependent thereon. The Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claims 3-5 and 7-9 and allow issuance thereof.

For similar reasons, the Applicants also do not find where the cited references render new Claims 10-12 obvious.

II. Rejection of Claims 2 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 2 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal in view of Bayya, Bernard and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,445,801 to Pastor, *et al.* (hereinafter "Pastor"). Claim 2 has been canceled. Regarding Claim 6, the Applicants respectfully disagree in view of the above comments and amended Claim 3. The Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate otherwise if the Examiner disagrees. Additionally, Pastor has not even been cited to address independent Claim 3 but to disclose the additional limitations of dependent Claim 6.

Thus, in view of amended independent Claim 3, the cited combination of Agarwal, Bayya, Bernard and Pastor does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of Claim 3 and Claim 6 which depends thereon. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claim 6 and allow issuance thereof.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 3-12.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC



J. Joel Justiss
Registration No. 48,981

Dated: July 15, 2008

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800